DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 049 EC 001 548

By- Tompkins, James R.; Allen, Adaline, Ed.

A Condensation of a Series of Addresses Relating to the Treatment, Rehabilitation and Education for Children.

Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.
Pub Date Oct 68
Note- 18p.; Condensation of addresses presented at five conferences.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
Descriptors- Autism, Educational Attitudes, Educational Facilities, *Educational Needs, Educational Planning, Educational Problems, Educational Trends, *Emotionally Disturbed, *Exceptional Child Education, Federal Aid, Federal Legislation, Federal Programs, Incidence, *National Programs, Personnel, *Professional Education, Professional Training, Psychoeducational Processes, Special Classes
Identifiers- Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Public Law 85 926 (amended)

Society's priorities and the history of federal activity with emotionally disturbed children are reviewed; the new Bureau of Education for the Handicapped is discussed; and the responsibilities of its three Divisions, Research, Educational Services, and Training Programs, are given. Expenditures for emotionally disturbed children are noted with the incidence of emotional disturbance mentioned as probably 2% of the school population. Problems of training teachers and administrators in higher institutions are outlined, including the lack of doctoral levels and difficulties in getting educators to clarify commitments to the handicapped. Emerging trends and issues discussed in the area of emotional disturbance are the cooperation of clinicians and educators, two separate definitions of emotional disturbance by educators and mental health specialists, abandonment of the medical model of disease and the special class model, expansion of the regular class teacher's knowledge, educational technology, a socially-psychologically orientated education cadre, recognition of civil liberties of deprived groups, and the concern of federal and state legislatures with emotionally disturbed children. (SN)

A CONDENSATION OF A SERIES OF ADDRESSES RELATING TO THE TREATMENT, REHABILITATION AND EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN

American Association for Childrens Residential Centers
November 4, 1967

American Association for the Advancement of Science
December 29, 1967

Interested Parent and Community Service Groups Under the Auspices of Bowling Green State University
January 27, 1968

Conference: "The School and the Child with Emotional Problems"
April 26, 1968

State and Local Chapters of National Society for Autistic Children
August 1, 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ED025049

S DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
RSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
ATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
OSITION OR POLICY.

BY
James R. Tompkins
Coordinator
Unit on Education of the
Emotionally Disturbed

ED025049

EC 001 548

EDITED
BY
Adaline Allen
Research Assistant
Unit on Education of the Emotionally Disturbed

October, 1968

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION - BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

There exists today a very real problem in securing appropriate programs, via Federal, State and local support, for disturbed children. There is keen competition among numerous interested groups to initiate and implement programs for various public priorities. Programs for crime control, riot control, poverty and job-training are pressing. All of these programs relate in several ways to the issues of mental health and education; but due to extreme social pressures to respond to these problems, specific opportunities for mental health and education programs may be delayed and/or funded at a less desirable level. Even within the interests of education and mental health, there are numerous programs for children, which makes the problem of obtaining priority programs specifically for the emotionally disturbed more complex.

We can make assumptions about the degree of society's interest by observing current legislation, community action and subsequent financial contributions for the education of emotionally disturbed children. People create and function in various societal groups such as labor groups; management groups; local, state and federal agencies; high, middle, low class entities; religious groups, ethnic groups; professional groups and so on, for every interest and sphere of life. These elements of our society are engaged in activities to maintain and increase benefits to serve their own best self-interest.

A variety of underlying value systems motivate and direct the behavior and activities of these groups. Understandably, these group activities are guided and based onknown and predictable facts and information to support their value systems. As new information

becomes available, value systems change, and priorities shift regarding the implementation of the group's goals and activities. These activities are specific for each group and are usually practical, useful and profitable; in other words, pragmatic. Therefore, it is of great importance to make available reliable comprehensive information regarding the emotionally disturbed child and his needs.

A resourceful society like ours needs the productivity of the emotionally disturbed. By failing to give services to children who need them, and by adhering to the principle of spending many millions of dollars on housing disturbed children in places of detention with inadequate programs we are really only providing a temporary holding action -- not a solution.

And so today, as a result of society's pragmatic approach, as well as its humanitarian concern, programs directly benefiting society's children in areas of health, education and welfare are beginning to take shape. But it is only a beginning.

In the last decade, our Government has responded with a commitment to extend and expand the educational and treatment services for handicapped children. During this period, Federal legislation has made possible, on a national scale, a better understanding that the Government intends that handicapped children shall have a future, that they are educable, and that they can make contributions to our society.

In reviewing the history of Federal activity we can identify the leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson, the late President John F. Kennedy, Senators Lester Hill and Wayne Morse, Congressman Hugh L. Carey of New York and the late Congressman John Forgarty,

as a few of the men who have dedicated their energies to championing the cause of providing education for all -- including handicapped children. Their leadership calls out for our response to implement and initiate programs to serve these handicapped children.

There is a new optimism. It is based on the knowledge that the great majority of handicapped children can find an independent and productive life, if they are aided by skilled and well trained hands. The establishment in January, 1967, of the new Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the U. S. Office of Education is one example of the dramatic impact of the Federal commitment, and reflects the belief in the usefulness of education as a bridge to self-sufficiency and self-respect for handicapped children.

The problem of providing educational services for emotionally disturbed children merits some serious consideration. Two aspects need to be evaluated -- first, the needs of these children in reference to education and training, and then the degree of success of present government to meet those needs.

A conservative estimate indicates that possibly 2% of the present total school age population -- are seriously emotionally disturbed, and in need of special educational services.

Some authorities familiar with the problem of educatining disturbed children, estimate that over 2% of the present school age population could probably be identified as seriously emotionally disturbed. This would mean that several million school age children are emotionally disturbed. Many millions of parents are involved in the agonizing process of seeking the help of professional educational services for their disturbed children.

On the basis of 2% of the school age population, the Division of Training Programs of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, has supported the training of a small percentage of the professional personnel currently needed for the education of emotionally disturbed children. Between 1964 and 1967, the U.S. Office of Education provided funds for the education of approximately 2,728 teachers and other supported personnel for emotionally disturbed children. On an average, there are four students in college and university training programs for every student receiving U. S. Office of Education support funds. At most, 12,000 educational personnel have been engaged in professional training in the area of emotionally disturbed since 1964. Based on conservative estimates of the prevalance of emotional disturbance in the school age population many thousands of teachers are still needed to meet present educational needs of emotionally disturbed children. It is even more difficult to provide information regarding the number of teachers engaged with the education of autistic children and other seriously disturbed children in view of unavailable and complex statistics on this subject. Some authorities estimate that of our total estimates of emotional disturbance in our school age population, 500,000 very young children are autistic or schizoprenic.

Approximately 130 colleges and universities throughout the nation are preparing to, or are engaged in training teachers for emotionally disturbed children. Seventy of these institutions of higher education have received support funds from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. Approximately 50 institutions of higher education receiving Bureau of Education for the Handicapped funds are actively preparing teaching personnel for disturbed children.

It appears that institutions of higher education are preparing teaching personnel predominately for special classes for the elementary school level and for residential or clinically oriented settings. The real crisis, however, is the need to train educational personnel for the pre-school and secondary school level children in our public school systems. Teachers who assist autistic children usually get their training and experience after their formal college or university training in settings serving autistic children.

At this point, I would like to explain the structure of your government's principle resource which, for a little over a year has been supporting and strengthening the Nation's efforts to meet the education needs of emotionally disturbed children.

The principal programs of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, as authorized by legislation encouraging program development and services for emotionally disturbed children, are administered by 1) the Division of Research; 2) the Division of Educational Services; and 3) the Division of Training Programs.

These three divisions implement a variety of legislative provisions concerned with education for the handicapped, including Public Law 85-926, amended by Public Law 88-164. This law provides funds to support research, demonstration programs, and educational personnel training in all areas of the handicapped. The Bureau's Division of Educational Services administers programs under Public Law 89-313, amendment to Title I and Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which authorizes grants to States to initiate, expand and improve educational services to handicapped children. Handicapped children are defined as mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled and other health

impaired children who by reason thereof require special education (Public Law 85-926, as amended).

To understand the dimensions of the Federal Government's activities in financing educational programs for emotionally disturbed children, these facts and figures should be considered. From 1964, to early April, 1968, the Division of Research has provided $3.04 million to support 26 individual research and demonstration projects for the emotionally disturbed. Of this number four projects related to the investigation of the problems of autistic or schizophrenic children's education have been supported. The appropriation for all types of research and demonstration projects between fiscal year 1964 and 1968 total $28.1 million in support of all handicapped children.

The Unit on Education of the Emotionally Disturbed in the Division of Training Programs will provide assistance as of fiscal year 1968 to approximately 70 training programs in colleges and universities in the preparation of educational personnel at a cost of $2.65 million. For fiscal year 1968, 101 institutions of higher education requested over $5 million for support. The appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 for teacher training programs in institutions of higher education, in all areas for the handicapped, totaled $24.5 million. Since fiscal year 1964, $109 million has been authorized and $94.5 million has been appropriated. Between fiscal year 1964 and 1968, $11.2 million will have been utilized for providing approximately 3,752 students with fellowships or traineeships awards for educating the emotionally disturbed.

Public Law 89-313, amendment to Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, offers grants to State education agencies directly responsible for education handicapped children. State-operated

residential treatment centers and day-care schools are benefiting from this program, as do children in private facilities utilized by State agencies for handicapped children. Since fiscal year 1966, $55.6 million has been allocated to the States. Of this total, approximately $6.8 million is being expended for the education of emotionally disturbed children. During fiscal year 1966 to 1968, approximately 27,684 children were served and are now receiving benefits under Title I, 89-313. Funds were also expended for staff, acquisition of equipment and relevant research, demonstration projects and program development to provide better service for the children.

Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provides grants to State education agencies to initiate, expand and improve educational related services for handicapped children in pre-school, elementary and secondary schools. Under this program $2.4 million was allocated to States, beginning May, 1967 to plan for development and implementation of special education projects. For fiscal year 1968, $154.5 million has been authorized to implement programs in all areas of handicapped conditions. However, the actual amount of the appropriation for this program for fiscal year 1968, provided only $15 million which will only permit the program to take its first step. The initial funding has allowed the personnel in State education agencies to assess and predict the educational services needed to provide the best education for a richer future of our handicapped children. Over half the states and several territories indicated in their early response to Title VI that one of their top priorities, is to provide appropriate education services and programs for emotionally disturbed children of which the autistic handicapped are included.

In view of the presently evolving legislation I cannot predict the degree of emergence of new federal and state legislation in support of treatment and education programs for our young emotionally disturbed. Presently, legislation and program development has been supported in relation to the broad spectrum of needs for all handicapped children, and delinquent and deprived children. The problem of treatment and education for disturbed children is often, however, an exacerbating component of other handicapping conditions. And similarly there are complicating factors in the training of teachers and administrators for programs for disturbed children and the problems facing the professional leadership in the preparation of educational personnel for emotionally disturbed children are legion. Indeed these issues and problems extend into the everyday life of children and into the entire stream of activity organized for their education and mental health. Progress is made in direct relation to the development and implementation of quality programs of institutions of higher education. Many more institutions are needed to engage in the preparation of educational personnel for disturbed children. A major limitation to expansion is the shortage of training locations adjacent to colleges and universities. For students to obtain a sound training, these facilities are essential. The shortage of student training locations is emphasized in the dearth of opportunities in public school settings, where many emotionally disturbed children are found. The teacher training institution and the public school facilities are often not coordinated with one another, and sometimes the problems of providing student teachers with appropriate experience in the public school is accorded a low priority by the educational leadership. Many training programs started in isolation and some still exist at this

level, either because of the lack of involvement of the college in the community, or because there is resistance on the part of the community to coordinate activities to create good facilities to make teacher training meaningful.

The needs of emotionally disturbed children also require the supportive services of school psychologists and school social worker. The State education agencies are in great need of well-trained administrators and supervisory personnel to assist communities in developing sound programs. Although personnel are becoming available, in part, through this support program, the positions are not developing. Where they do develop, salaries are not sufficiently attractive to recruit personnel with the qualifications to assure the development of sound programs. Further, if the salaries and positions are attractive enough, people with experience and training to fill these positions are reluctant to assume what sometimes appears to be a paper-pushing job. The need for training opportunities for administrators and supervisors are as critical, as are training opportunities for teachers. Further, the lack of training opportunities for leadership at the doctoral level in institutions of higher education is perhaps the most critical. During fiscal year 1968, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped will be supporting approximately 15 on-going doctoral level programs for the preparation of educational personnel for the emotionally disturbed child.

The dearth of teacher training programs create a serious situation affecting the preparation of educational personnel in the area of emotionally disturbed for most regions in the South, Southwest, Plains States, Inter-mountain areas and portions of the New England States.

These regions will only profit by planning and collating resources on a regional basis to utilize effectively available expertise.

For fiscal year 1968, less than 5% of approximately 100 proposals requesting financial assistance to support teacher education for disturbed children identified the preschool and secondary school levels as target areas. Furthermore, there has been no significant development to meet the needs of culturally different or deprived children who also exhibit emotional difficulties such as the Indian, Mexican and Negro child and the White Appalachian child in the United States.

The educational leadership is now beginning to expand efforts to explore the possibilities to improve the education of disturbed children by and through strategies other than the special class model and in settings other than colleges and universities. The large number of children in need and the recognition of the lack of professional personnel must direct thinking and planning toward developing other modes than the special class for approaching the problem of educating the disturbed child.

There is also a need to raise the question of what cooperative services could be made available by health, education, social, welfare, and legal professionals and agencies. If our professional expertise representing these various interests do not relate and plan together, our children will never really profit fully from the potential resources of this nation.

It is difficult to conceive, but personnel engaged in programs of treatment, rehabilitation, and education for children appear to have

an idiopathic communication disorder, e. i., an unexplainable breakdown in initiating and carrying out effective communication. This problem exists among many professional groups in terms of intra-group as well as inter-group dialogue. It seems to me that the organizations identified with education, mental health and welfare should provide high priority for interagency planning to provide maximum benefit for the treatment, rehabilitation and education for children. There needs to be more joint arrangements to better the lot of such children through the appropriate organizations. Our clinical and educational interests must pool their energies and resources on behalf of the needs of children.

There are hopeful signs that greater cooperative efforts are emerging at the community level and that these efforts are helping to clarify both the role of each element and, the extent each will work with the others, if all our children are to receive the services they need. However, State education agencies are going to have to take a firm stand if they wish to insure that children in State facilities administered by other State agencies and departments such as training schools, penal institutions and State hospitals, receive the same quality education required for children in local communities. These institutions which provide training for teachers of children with behavioral disorders could be of great assistance in up-grading their quality of educational services.

We are in the process of identifying and clarifying our commitments, and the concepts that form the foundation for teacher training, and the ultimate useful care and education of the emotionally disturbed. Educators are becoming more articulate about education and more meaningfully aligned to philosophies of education and methods of

re-education. Perhaps some training programs are carred out in the spirit of, "You never can tell" and include a bit of everything. Time for thoughtful detachment is needed to evaluate programs so that institutions of higher education, in closed association with student-training locations in public schools and treatment centers can make a major commitment to a particular theoretical position for determination of the contribution that might be made by various systems of thought or methods of educational intervention.

This is not easy. Sometimes, we are not dealing merely with emotionally disturbed children, but rather with whatever the regular public school will reject for which it can find no other reason than behavioral deviation. And we are only now beginning, through research to study meaningful and reliable systems of classifications from the point of view of education. We need to determine what kind of program action to take for a particular child with a particular school's organizational stmucture to provide adequate assistance. Now, we are often called upon to rescue the school failures without an opportunity to alter the organizational basis of the school which could contribute to the fact that a particular child is seen as emotionally disturbed. Because of our commitment, both to service for children and the need for sound training, much can be done to facilitate the translation of what we now know into responsible programs to service and to make possible the research necessary for improved programs to reduce this great waste of human potential.

There remain numerous problems which must first be dealt with. There are many difficulties personnel experience in attemption to provide services for disturbed children, but definite trends and issues are emerging which can be identified as a result of program developments associated with the education of emotionally disturbed children and

for handicapped children in general.

1) Fundamentally, the treatment and education of autistic and seriously emotionally disturbed children is so complex that there is difficulty in ascertaining where educational components versus clinical components of programming for such children begin and end. There is a question as to where therapy begins and ends in various programs designed for autistic and seriously disturbed children. Children who are autistic have language disorders, and impediments to logical coherent language and speech development. They appear to be retarded with serious learning disorders. Sometimes they are very quiet and withdrawn, while at other times, they are agitated and hyperactive. Generally their behavior prohibits the effective use of traditional educational approaches to assist them in their education. However, they are considered educable and their education is associated with both clinical-oriented treatment and educational practices. However, there is a need for the professional leadership of such programs to clearly define their educational focus, if they wish to accrue benefits from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in view of criticisms that their program appears clinically oriented but not educationally devised. Other agencies such as the National Institute for Mental Health have expressed interest in supporting clinically based programs for autistic children.

2) According to Dr. Matthew J. Trippe of the University of Michigan in his recent contribution to Volume I of Educational Therapy: "When we ask questions, 'How do we identify emotionally disturbed children?' 'what are their characteristics, we assume that they posses a "thing" which is out there and can be correctly identified through proper definition. In a sense, this puts the cart before the horse since an educational definition of disturbance as much as any other definition, has to be evaluated on the basis of its clarity and usefulness and not on whether it leads to the correct selection of the children who are "really" disturbed. Current practices suggest that there are two definitions of disturbance which are used at different levels for different purposes. The first definition disclaims participation by educators in formulating the definition. By this definition, an emotionally disturbed child is one so diagnosed by an appropriate mental health specialist. Most legislation for disturbed children is tied to such as definition. This is not suprising since citizens intent on obtaining school services for disturbed children have looked to and worked in association with psychiatrists and other mental health professionals for support, guidance and even assistance in drawing up legislation.

Educators should resist such a definition and consequent eligibility for service on two counts. The first is that such a classification might not be the most useful for providing educational services. The second is that the definition is not clearly communicated. The diagnosis of emotionally disturbance has been shown to be extremely unreliable and, therefore, much depends on who sees the child under what circumstances and in what context. Surveys of the extent of serious emotional disturbance in the population of school children range from less than one percent to fifteen percent and more. Even though the rates differ by age and sex, which may account for some of the differences, these findings make it clear that the diagnosis of emotional disturbance is vague and unreliable.

The other prevalent definition is organizationally based, and as suggested earlier, involves the classification of the child as disturbed if he violates classroom norms and no other customary way of explaining this violation is readily available. If children who show disturbed behavior in school have not other readily detectable disability and

> particularly if they may be seen as disturbed. Many view this situation with alarm, correctly observing that it amounts to a definition by default and urge that it be guarded against. Unfortunately, the most often stated alternative is to recommend diagnosis by a mental health specialist and the difficulties with this resolution have been pointed out. The task for education is to concentrate on developing relatively clear definitions that relate to provisions that can be made for children through the pattern of education."

3) Seasoned and well trained special educators who are experienced in the education of disturbed children are abandoning their reliance on a medical model of disease, medically oriented labels or categories, as a primary basis for planning educational services for disturbed and other handicapped children. Again, Dr. Trippe and other educational leadership concerned with educating exceptional children are asking "what kinds of educationally oriented programs for what kinds of children?" and looking at the children in relation to the kinds of programs that can be provided by educational personnel in the school.

4) The special class model utilized to provide educational services for disturbed children as fesponse fer initiating a productive reaction for meeting the educational needs of disturbed children is coming under increasingly sharp and highly negative criticism. Other educational strategies are taking precedence, such as the crisis teacher model, diagnostic teacher model, prescriptive teacher model, consultant and itinerant teacher models, to name a few.

5) There is an increasing concern for identifying the need to expand the role of the regular public school classroom teacher to have knowledge and some expertise to assure the early identification of disturbed children and other types of handicapped children and thus provide appropriate educational intervention in relation to the need and

quality of disturbance or disability. The new Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, U. S. Office of Education is highly interested in the growth of programs which uniquely assist the regular classroom teacher in educating handicapped children.

6) An educational technology is appearing and growing which is highly sophisticated and successful in the creation and utilization of educational media and materials including the design and use of machines, electronic equipment to assist distrubed children in the learning process.

7) The unrest in various segments of our society, the social revolution, the phenomenon of protest, and the conflicts with the the "establishment" is beginning to produce a socially-psychologically oriented and identified cadre of educational leadership for the treatment, rehabilitation and education of disturbed, disadvantaged, and delinquent children. They are beginning to assess regular and special education's role in this "happening" particularly from the point of view of casuality and responsive program reaction. A social, psychological oriented "education power" is generating!

8) Concern is increasingly evident over the civil liberties of school age children who predictably are more often our disturbed, delinquent, disadvantaged children. Judicial systems at local, State and Federal levels are influencing the actions of public school personnel in the planning and programming for these children.

9) Federal and State executive and legislative bodies are providing astonishing leadership in demonstrating their concerns for the education of handicapped children. Our most significiant illustration of this phenomenon is the newly established Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the U. S. Office of Education.

Our progress in developing and expanding services for disturbed children although outstanding, is now only at the starting mark. The game is a race against time. All interested people need to pull together their energies and resources "to release," as President Lyndon Baines Johnson recently remarked, "a great wealth of human potential that was once wantonly wasted." We must stress the premise of U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II that "there is a promise of a richer future for these handicapped youngsters and new hope for their parents and teachers." Dr. James J. Gallagher, Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has identified our goals in these words, "for the self realization and self sufficiency to the limits of each handicapped individual."